

**BAR MINUTES  
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE  
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW  
Regular Meeting  
April 20, 2021 – 5:00 PM  
Zoom Webinar**



Welcome to this Regular Monthly Meeting of the Charlottesville Board of Architectural Review (BAR). Due to the current public health emergency, this meeting is being held online via Zoom. The meeting process will be as follows: For each item, staff will make a brief presentation followed by the applicant's presentation, after which members of the public will be allowed to speak. Speakers shall identify themselves, and give their current address. Members of the public will have, for each case, up to three minutes to speak. Public comments should be limited to the BAR's jurisdiction; that is, regarding the exterior design of the building and site. Following the BAR's discussion, and before the vote, the applicant shall be allowed up to three minutes to respond, for the purpose of clarification. Thank you for participating.

**Members Present:** Jody Lahendro, Carl Schwarz, Andy McClure, James Zehmer, Breck Gastinger, Cheri Lewis, Robert Edwards, Tim Mohr  
**Members Absent:** Ron Bailey  
**Staff Present:** Patrick Cory, Joe Rice, Robert Watkins, Jeff Werner  
**Pre-Meeting:**

The Pre-Meeting was done in closed session.

**Motion – Mr. Gastinger – I move that the BAR members certify by recorded vote that to the best of each member's knowledge, fully public business matters lawfully exempted from the open meeting requirements of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act and identified in the motion convening the closed meeting were heard, discussed, or considered in the closed meeting. (Second by Mr. Schwarz) Motion passed 7-0 with one abstention.**

The start of the meeting was delayed for ten minutes.

**The meeting was called to order at 5:40 PM by the Chairman.**

**A. Matters from the public not on the agenda**

No Comments from the Public

**B. Consent Agenda** (Note: Any consent agenda item may be pulled and moved to the regular agenda if a BAR member wishes to discuss it, or if any member of the public is present to comment on it. Pulled applications will be discussed at the beginning of the meeting.)

1. BAR Meeting Minutes from December 15, 2020

**2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 21-04-01

200 West South Street, TMP 280100000

Downtown ADC District

Owner: 200 South Street A Virginia Inn PA

Applicant: Ross Fillman/Uhler and Co.  
Project: Landscaping Plan, South Street Inn

### 3. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 21-04-02  
16 Elliewood Avenue, TMP 090097000  
The Corner ADC District  
Owner: Elliewood Entertainment, Inc.  
Applicant: Anderson McClure/Biltmore Grill  
Project: Patio pavilion, Biltmore Grill

Motion to approve the Consent Agenda by Mr. Gastinger. (Second by Mr. Lahendro). Motion passes 7-0 with one abstention.

### C. **Deferred Items**

#### 4. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 21-03-05  
420 West Main, TMP 290011000  
Downtown ADC District  
Owner: A Cadgene, Main Street Land Trust, LLC  
Applicant: Greg Jackson/TOPIA design  
Project: Construct canopy for dining area

**Jeff Werner, Staff Report** – Year Built: c1960 District: Downtown ADC District Status: Contributing. The former gas station was occupied by Jones Wrecker until it was renovated into a restaurant in 2001. The West Main Street Historic District (NRHP) describes the building as: Cinderblock faced with red and white metal; one story; flat roof; four bays; flat canopy over gas pumps, 1960-61, replacing 1931 gas station. Site of early 19th century brick blacksmith shop, possibly not demolished until 1931. R.F. Harris foundry on this lot and 416 West Main c1850 - c1930. CoA request is for the construction of a metal canopy at the front (north) elevation. Proposed is a cover for an exterior dining area for shade and weather protection. The new metal canopy will be bolted to the building and supported by columns. The design intent is to be compatible yet distinct. The new structure is inspired by the form and materials of the original building, which was a gas/service station. The existing building is a modification of the original building, and currently is a restaurant. The new canopy has three steel columns (on concrete bases) that align with and share the configuration of the two original slanted steel columns (on a curb), that supported the gas pump canopy. The I-beam and channel steel structure follows the general configuration and structural logic of the original canopy, but is separate framing and alignment and is different materials and colors. The canopy roof is a semi-translucent material that further distinguishes it as new and different from the original building, which has painted metal decking. Although compatible with the language and spirit of the original gas station the new construction will be differentiated, set back with a silver gray finish and white polycarbonate roofing. The silver gray color correlates with the not-original anodized aluminum of the storefront, garage doors, and exterior railing. The white poly roof decking relates with the current white building. With the original gas pump drive through canopy no longer open -and now enclosed with storefront- the new canopy returns an open air feel and function, and brings a balance to the building and site. Refinements following the March 2021 BAR discussion: The proposed canopy has a slimmer overall profile--with a thinner fascia and simpler structure. The existing building expands its yellow color--on the original canopy and the raised metal building band- to better define and accentuate it. The new silver gray canopy is lower and set back from the existing canopy to be a subordinate and

complementary. The new canopy edge is thinner with a 9-1/2" high custom angled box gutter on a 10" channel. The previous fascia was 13" high with a 12" c-channel and 1" of flashing, with a concealed gutter. The slimming created an external gutter/fascia that has a slant the same angle as the columns. The fascia profile remains horizontal/level, with an internal sloped gutter leading to a downspout at the building's northwest corner, which is white in color to blend in. In thinning and simplifying the canopy a noticeable W8 I-beam--that spanned (east west) from the existing W8 (that bears on the existing two columns)--was decoupled and removed, with the three new columns now going directly to the new canopy's primary W10 I-beams (north south). For improved lighting and ventilation two large industrial style fans are under the canopy with strong but dimmable LED lights that meets the BAR lighting criteria. String lights complement. The W-8's of the new canopy are connected/welded directly to the C-channel of the existing canopy. Then blocking is added between the W8's. A ceiling soffit conceals the 2' area where the existing and new structural members intersect. The color matches existing the warm light gray. 420 West Main (April 14, 2021) 3 No seasonal enclosures (clear walls) are being proposed.

**Greg Jackson, Applicant** – The canopy profile is much thinner. The edge is different in that it is sloped. It is now set back down from the existing canopy. We took on the building to celebrate the color of the canopy and bring it out. One of the additions at the time was this yellow tile structure. We went with that. It seems to fit a gas station type of feel as well as to snap out the canopy and bring that around the building. It really helps the building get stronger and be more emphasized in of itself. For the lighting, we looked at what we thought would be appropriate. Big fans seem to work there. We wanted to keep it really simple. We had the lights with the fans. They're dimmable and they meet the criteria that you gave for the rear. If we did lighting, it should be this with the certain criteria. On the existing canopy, those two existing slanted columns that hold up that canopy rest on a W-8 that then holds up W-10s. That used to go all the way across. We have figured out a way to not do that all of the way across and leave it as existing. The new columns would go straight up to W-10s. That makes it thinner. We also follow through with some specifics in the designs of the fascia profile. That's an internal gutter to the outside making the whole thing thinner. We worked on that a little bit to make that stand out more as something that is different from the existing and makes a cleaner connection.

## **QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC**

No Questions from the Public

## **QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD**

**Mr. Schwarz** – You did mention the flashing where the new roof meets the old. You said that you intend to use an adhered flashing. You seem confident that this is going to work. I am a little confused as to how it is going to work. Are you going to have to remove the brick metal flash under it? Are you going to take flashing to the face of the metal? What is your thought on how that works?

**Mr. Jackson** – I consulted with the roofer. He felt that would be an appropriate solution to use the membrane to take the poly-roof along the edge. Where it attaches to the back of the building, we likely might put some kind of metal flashing and attach to the building with the membrane. We are going to keep it low profile and pick the appropriate color. I think I have said white that would work with the roofing.

## **COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

No Comments from the Public

## COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

**Mr. Mohr** – I like the way you resolved the gutter. Originally, you had a really small one. It is now a big one and very clean. Having that one single gutter and getting the drain down the back really works.

**Mr. Jackson** – We went to a C-10 instead of a C-12. That helped narrow it down. We couldn't go any further than that with the W-10s. The gutter box is slanted at 9.5 inches there. I think that's going to be the profile you see and perceive. We're able to get an internal sloped gutter all of the way across and down at the right slope. It needs about 4 inches.

**Mr. Mohr** – I think it is a good resolution. I think you've really resolved the questions we had about it being too integrated with the other structure. It's distinctly its own animal. You're not carrying that one beam through underneath. It works for me. I think it is a big improvement.

**Mr. Gastinger** – I think this is a huge improvement. I think the color really hits it in all of the right places. It really distinguishes and pulls out the original canopy in a nice way. I appreciate the clarity in distinction. I am concerned about the multi-color stream lights. I would prefer a single white light given the prominence of that corner.

**Mr. Jackson** – Those lights can change colors. We can get any type of product. My understanding is that they will be all white, all red, and all green. They can may be different colors at one time. I think that 95% of the time they will be regular white lights.

**Mr. Mohr** – Can you balance the color?

**Mr. Jackson** – I think it is all adjustable. That's just a particular product. It does say multi-color. I think the intent is that they can be different colors.

**Mr. Schwarz** – The primary light source is coming from the ceiling fans?

**Mr. Jackson** – That's correct. That handles or addresses having a more permanent type of light. I like having the fans. I think the big fans will be really neat. They're quite large. That type of larger fan goes at a slower RPM. It has a nice effect. It meets the criteria that you were looking for.

**Mr. Schwarz** – I am not going to hold you up for the stream lights. I think you have done a great job.

**Mr. Werner** – The concern about different colored lights is primarily that sign is on all night. If this is lighting during hours of operation, that might help. A sign out on West Main would be on all night creating a red glow.

**Motion – Mr. Lahendro – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed patio canopy at 420 West Main Street satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Andy McClure seconds motion. Motion passes (8-0).**

### D. New Items

#### 5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application BAR 21-04-04

517 Rugby Road, TMP 050046000  
Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable ADC District  
Owner: Alumni of Alpha Mu, Inc  
Applicant: Garrett Rouzer/Dalgliesh Gilpin Paxton Architects  
Project: Alterations to fraternity house  
Note: This is a formal submittal; however, this will be treated as a preliminary discussion, per City Code section Sec. 34-282(c)(4).

**Jeff Werner, Staff Report** – Year Built: c1910 District: Rugby Road - University Circle - Venable Neighborhood ADC District Status: Contributing. (The house is also a contributing structure to the Rugby Road - University Corner Historic District - VLR 1983, NRHP 1984.) Constructed as a private residence, this 2-1/2 story, Colonial Revival houses is one of the few in the district covered entirely with wood shingles. (However, it is reported that the house originally had clapboard siding, which may exist below the shingles.) The house features a symmetrical, three-bay front façade with a hipped roof and a front, hipped dormer with latticed casement windows. On the side (south) façade is a two-story bay, on the front (east) facade is a center bay, distyle porch with attenuated Roman Doric columns and a hipped roof. The entrance door features geometrically glazed sidelights and an elliptical, fan-light transom. In the 1964, the house transitioned to a fraternity house, as it is currently used. CoA request for construction of a rear addition, removal of the existing front porch, and constructing a new front porch. While this a formal CoA request, due to the estimated cost of the addition, a preliminary discussion is required. The BAR may decide to take action on the porch request independent of the addition; however, the resubmittal for the addition would then be treated as a separate CoA, requiring a new application and the related fee. During a preliminary discussion the BAR may, by consensus, express an opinion about the project as presented. (For example, the BAR might express consensus support for elements of the project, such as its scale and massing.) Such comments will not constitute a formal motion and the result will have no legal bearing, nor will it represent an incremental decision on the required CoA. There are two key objectives of a preliminary discussion: Introduce the project to the BAR; and allow the applicant and the BAR to establish what is necessary for a successful final submittal. That is, a final submittal that is complete and provides the information necessary for the BAR to evaluate the project using the ADC District Design Guidelines and related review criteria. In response to any questions from the applicant and/or for any recommendations to the applicant, the BAR should rely on the germane sections of the ADC District Design Guidelines and related review criteria. While elements of other chapters may be relevant, staff recommends that the BAR refer to the criteria in Chapter II--Site Design and Elements, Chapter III--New Construction and Additions, Chapter IV—Rehabilitation, and Chapter VII--Demolitions and Moving. As a checklist for the preliminary discussion, the criteria for Additions in Chapter III: • Function and Size • Location • Design • Replication of Style • Materials and Features • Attachment to Existing Building The BAR should also consider the building elements and details necessary to evaluate the project. Renderings and schematics communicates mass, scale, design and composition; however a complete application should include details and specific information about the projects materials and components. For example: • Measured drawings: Elevations, wall details, etc. • Roofing: Flat, hipped, etc. Metal, slate, asphalt. Flashing details. • Gutters/downspouts: Types, color, locations, etc. Foundation. • Walls: Masonry, siding, stucco, etc. • Soffit, cornice, siding, and trim. • Color palette. • Doors and windows: Type, lite arrangement, glass spec, trim details, etc. • Porches and decks: Materials, railing and stair design, etc. • Landscaping/hardscaping: Grading, trees, low plants, paving materials, etc. • Lighting. Fixture cut sheets, lamping, etc. The house was constructed c1910. The 1920 Sanborn Map indicates a porch of a similar size and location to the existing, if not the same one. The porch now incorporates wood decks on either side; however, the columns (full and engaged), the roof, and the entrance remain intact, allowing the existing [presumed original] porch to remain identifiable as a discrete element of the historic façade. In the design guidelines for porches (Section D in Rehabilitations) are three

specific recommendations that should be applied here: 1. The original details and shape of porches should be retained including the outline, roof height, and roof pitch. 4. Replace an entire porch only if it is too deteriorated to repair or is completely missing, and design to match the original as closely as possible. 7. Do not remove or radically change entrances and porches important in defining the building's overall historic character.

**Mr. Lahendro** – Is this a COA application or is this a preliminary discussion?

**Mr. Werner** – It came in as an application. I am calling it what it is. I don't know the cost of this project. I think the information is lacking for you to issue a COA. Given that it came in as an application, you can have that discussion and defer at the end for action at a later date.

**Mr. Lahendro** – I would like to know what we're reviewing here and what the applicants wants us to review.

**Mr. Schwarz** – The applicant should tell us what he wants us to review. I think we need to treat this as a preliminary discussion. It's not a complete application. There are some missing documents. Our ordinance requires that this is a preliminary discussion given the cost of the project.

**Garrett Rouzer, Applicant** – That is understood. We expect to exceed that \$350,000 cap. If this could be treated as our required preliminary discussion and we can receive feedback from the Board, we would appreciate that.

**Mr. Zehmer** – I thought that I heard that the expansion of the current front porch deck was approved by a previous BAR. The staff report says prior BAR actions determined that the enlargement of the deck is not appropriate.

**Mr. Werner** – The deck was approved but not the materials. When someone comes in with an application, staff can say that it is incomplete and not send to the BAR. We still want to have some review. You can defer to next month. The applicant can bring the same thing back. By accepting an application, it does not compel you to consider approval if it is not ready to be approved. I will get clarification on what happened. My understanding is that the deck was approved but not the materials and railings.

**Mr. Zehmer** – It would be helpful to know the clarity on that and know if this particular applicant steps in line with BAR actions and approvals.

**Mr. Rouzer** – There are two elements happening here. One is the front porch replacement. The other larger move is the addition of the western part towards the back of the lot. You can see the grey-scaled portion is the existing house with the new addition basically on the left hand side of the sheet. The intent here is to continue with materials as far as the asphalt roof and tying into that hardy plank siding and brick foundation work along with clad window units. We are tying in the new construction basically behind the mass of the existing building. This is the south elevation portion. The north section here with the existing on the left hand side and the new on the right.

**Mr. Lahendro** – Is the existing house still shingled and painted white and the addition is clabbered?

**Mr. Rouzer** – It is wood siding. The addition is proposed to be cement board siding.

**Mr. Lahendro** – The existing house is not shingled. I see white. Are the shingles painted white?

**Mr. Werner** – In this older report, it says that in 1987, they removed the wood shades. That's the entirety. At this point in time, it is all clabbered.

## **QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC**

**Eric Edwardson** – It is Masonite siding permanently clabbered. It was replaced in 1987. The shingles that had been there were pulled off and replaced.

## **QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD**

**Ms. Lewis** – Knowing that you have Masonite siding, you wouldn't consider replacing that?

**Mr. Edwardson** – It had degraded in a number of places pretty seriously. I know that they had some trouble. The siding comes down pretty low to the ground in a lot of places. Water has done damage to it over the years. The hardy plank was a better product at this point.

**Ms. Lewis** – Knowing that the shingles were removed and it is not an original material, it does have a tendency to degrade. It seems like it would be a nice opportunity. I think the hardy plank would fit our guidelines. I wouldn't have any concern replacing the Masonite siding if you wanted to do that.

**Mr. Werner** – The flanking decks that you see were in place. In 2014, the request was to extend that further around the south side. That is what was not approved. Those wing decks were there at that time. There was a series of other improvements that were done back in the 80s. The 2014 request was some improvements that were approved. It was the extension of the deck that was not approved. What you see didn't go in without BAR review. That happened prior to the BAR reviewing that as a house within a district.

**Mr. Schwarz** – With the new porch, is that intended to match the existing? Are you copying the detail? Or are you approximating it and making a larger front porch?

**Mr. Rouzer** – The intent was to take those details and carry those over those bays. The existing wood porch extensions would be rebuilt. The intent was to take that existing center bay and extend it over the front elevation.

**Mr. Schwarz** – Are all of the materials composite?

**Mr. Rouzer** – Yes.

**Mr. Zehmer** – Basically, you're tearing off that original porch completely and replacing it with four new columns and a new roof. Is that the intent?

**Mr. Rouzer** – That's the intent but keeping with the details that are there now. That's basically in that center bay. We would use that center bay to drive those details.

**Ms. Lewis** – Is the current profile hipped? Are you replicating that on the new one? The pictures aren't really clear about what the existing is. It's hard to tell.

**Mr. Rouzer** – Yes, the existing is hipped. In image 5, you can see the angle.

**Ms. Lewis** – It definitely is a little bit different profile. Is the height of the roof the same from the bottom of the existing porch? Would the columns be the same height?

**Mr. Rouzer** – Yes. That would be the intent.

**Ms. Lewis** – My only concern would be the beautiful light over the door. I am just making sure that is visible. We're not seeing drawings with dimensions and a little bit more detail. I just wanted to confirm that would be important for my vote.

**Mr. Mohr** – If I was to take the porch drawing literally, the columns seem more slender and the eave more exaggerated. I would be surprised if the roof pitch wasn't flatter. The drawing seems more generic than specific to that detail. Am I right about that? If you look at the entablature in the photo, the eave bears out more projection to it.

**Mr. Rouzer** – If that's a concern, we can certainly adjust that, ideally adjusting so that the roof functions better. Either way would be fine.

**Ms. Lewis** – The existing porch is quite a simple porch. There's not a whole lot of fuss on this property at the cornice or soffits.

**Mr. Gastinger** – While I think the porch design proposed is a reasonable approach, there's not a lot of support in our guidelines for this kind of change. In Chapter 4, Section B1, it says the original details in the shape of porches should be retained including the outlying roof height and roof pitch. Number 4 says replacing an entire porch only if it is too deteriorated to repair or is completely missing and designed to match the original as closely as possible. Number 7 says to not remove or radically change entrances, porches, and important defining the building's overall historic character. The Secretary of Interior standards also have very stringent recommendations relative to changing the primary entrance of this historic structure. I am not convinced that this is necessary. I am supportive of the addition in the back. I have real problems with the porch proposal.

**Mr. Lahendro** – I would second that. The porch is clearly an important character defining feature of the house on the main elevation, centered on this elevation, the main decorative feature, and it is historic. I could never vote for destroying a historic character defining feature to replace it with something else.

## **COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

No Comments from the Public

## **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

**Mr. Mohr** – I agree with Jody and Breck on the porch. I don't see much differentiation between the old and the new. One way I could see bringing some of the house's original character back would be to go to hardy shingles or hardy shakes on the existing building. At least you have contextual difference between the old and the new and harken back to what the house was clad in originally. If anything is done to the porch, it has to be a secondary addition to the porch.

The dormers on the back of the house have very thin walls. Is that really as they are going to be or just a schematic? The dormer walls seem awfully thin.



**Mr. Rouzer** – The intent is to flat frame those and make that a 5 quarter by fours. The idea is to go ahead and keep those as thin as possible.

**Mr. Mohr** – Resembling the Queen Anne dormer on the front as far as its window to wall relationship? The front dormer has very thin walls.

**Mr. Rouzer** – There is a diamond shaped pattern on those existing windows we were not carrying. That is the intent.

**Mr. Schwarz** – You will be OK getting a building permit? How is that going to be insulated?

**Mr. Rouzer** – Rigid insulation. We're concerned about it.

**Mr. Schwarz** – I agree with Tim on this. We have had a couple projects where we see very thin, historic rooflines. When things get built, it appears much, much 'chunkier.' If you're assuring us that it is going to look like this, that's great. We just want to make sure we don't get any surprises later. It's really unfortunate when that does happen.

**Mr. Rouzer** – We have done this on prior projects that exist in the city.

**Mr. Edwardson** – I have a picture about the siding issue. It's from Coy Bearfoot's Corner book.

**Mr. Werner** – The shingles were reported in a 1983 survey with the note that it was believed that the house was originally clabbered. It was odd pointing that this house was the only house in the district with shingles and then say we don't think this house was originally here.

**Ms. Lewis** – The notation actually says clabbered underneath to be believed weather board.

**Mr. Werner** – That proved to be true with the renovations after that.

**Mr. Edwardson** – This picture clearly shows that it is clabbered siding. It also shows a railing on top of that porch roof.

**Ms. Lewis** – What year is that?

**Mr. Edwardson** – I believe that the picture is around 1921. It is referenced in the book. I managed to get a digital version from one of the University groups.

**Mr. Zehmer** – Looking at that photo on the south side, was there an open porch that later was enclosed?

**Mr. Edwardson** – There's an open porch and a part underneath that was enclosed as well.

**Mr. Zehmer** – I think it would be awesome to include that photograph in the presentation materials so we can reference it. As you're developing your drawings, we would need to see a drawing that shows everything that would be removed. On the rear of the elevation of the house, it looks like there's a stair tower bump out. I don't know if that was original to the house. We would want to see that clearly shown on the demo plan. Looking at the photo, it looks like there are two chimneys currently existing in the house. I did like Tim's idea of similar materials for the original portion of the house and the rear

addition. I think the original was clabbered siding. It looked like there were some pretty strong vertical corner boards.

**Mr. Werner** – That came up in the 2014 discussion. There was a lot of work done.

**Mr. Mohr** – My concern right now is there's not enough differentiation between old and new.

**Mr. Schwarz** – It looks like the only differentiation is that you have a different exposure on your siding. You just told us that you're going to replace the siding on the original house as well. Does that mean everything is going to be the same exposure?

**Mr. Rouzer** – No. We would differentiate between the exposures with definitely keeping the smaller on the historic portion of the house and going with a wider on the new addition.

**Mr. Schwarz** – Our guidelines say not to use the same roofline or eave line. You do step back the massing. We have been a little lenient on some of those things. I do think this one is so subtle with the differences. I can think of some other methods where you can find some differentiation.

**Mr. Mohr** – I was thinking about the shingles and maybe doing away with the floor boards throughout the corner; something that makes it distinct relative to the clabbered house.

**Mr. Schwarz** – It looks like you are using the artisan siding. I know it is a better product than the standard James Hardy stuff.

**Mr. Mohr** – Thinking about shingles from a maintenance standpoint and trying to think of a way to differentiate the old and the new a bit more. It is a substantial addition. That's the danger when you're carrying a whole lot of the same stylistic cues all the way around.

**Mr. Zehmer** – You could also consider a different roofing material for the original versus the addition.

**Mr. Mohr** – The boarding is significantly different. If it is 4 inch on the old house, what are you thinking for the new part?

**Mr. Rouzer** – Artisan has a 7.35 inch reveal with their 8 inch boards.

**Mr. Mohr** – What do you have on the old house?

**Mr. Rouzer** – I think it is 4.5. It is significantly narrower.

**Mr. Schwarz** – Does the house have gutters? Or are they internal?

**Mr. Edwardson** – It should have gutters. They may have disappeared from time to time in its history.

**Mr. Schwarz** – When this comes back, it would be good to see the gutters on the elevations.

**Mr. Rouzer** – Our intent here was to really tie into that roofline and the eave line coming around and continuing that gutter profile on the existing into the new. Is there concern about doing that? Should we have greater differentiation there?

**Mr. Schwarz** – I am OK if you use the same roofline. You need to find something that differentiates this more. Maybe that is breaking the roofline or maybe some other tactic. You need to find something that does a little bit more.

**Mr. Mohr** – Breaking the roofline in a case like this seems forced. It is more about doing something with the materials. I think it gets forced if you drop the eave a foot. Internally, it makes sense to have the eave at the same height.

**Mr. Lahendro** – It appears that the addition is set back from the corners of the historic house a couple of feet. Unfortunately, the elevation drawing if it was shaded or showed the shadow line, that would help a lot in indicating that one block is distinct from another. I don't mind seeing the eave lower. I think that does help with the differentiation between the two parts. The other options you pointed out was (different roofing materials. Different siding materials are all fine and acceptable. I haven't given the addition a lot of thought.

**Mr. Schwarz** – Is there anybody who would be supportive of replacing the porch and building it back larger?

**Ms. Lewis** – I probably would be supportive if the profile of the porch would remain the same. The renderings are a completely different porch. The entablature is 'fussier' than what's there. The 1984 nomination notes that the columns are intonated doric. They seem to have some detail on the top. They are much plainer and thinner than what is proposed here. The railings are not reflective of the existing historic building. I would love to see a lattice in lieu of these. That's probably picking too much up from the windows. I wonder if something else can be done with the railings so that it looks less chunky.

**Mr. Lahendro** – They could go to the historic photograph that Mr. Edwardson showed and take that railing and replicate it.

**Mr. Mohr** – If you could have the original porch and add wings to it, it would have to be set back slightly. There's something you could take off the original porch.

**Mr. Edwardson** – There is nothing set in stone with how that porch would work.

**Mr. Schwarz** – We have precedent. We have denied far smaller expansions of porches.

**Mr. Rouzer** – With that feedback, can we do a deferral on the front porch and come back with something more sensitive to that historic photo and the setback portions. Would that be an option?

**Mr. Schwarz** – When you come back with the full COA, you could present a different idea. If we had to break up the approval, we could vote to approve the rear addition and defer you on the front porch. If you still want to keep trying to find a solution for the front porch, please do include in your next submittal. It might get broken out of that. It might make it. It might convince us all.

**Mr. Mohr** – I can see putting a porch up where the side porch used to be. That's even on the south side of the house.

**Mr. Zehmer** – I think that porch is there. It has just been enclosed.

**Mr. Mohr** – I assume you want the space and not have it as a porch. If you restored that as a porch or having that as an outdoor deck space over there, it is more appropriate to modify that rather than the old porch on the front of the house.

**Ms. Lewis** – I wonder what my fellow members of the BAR think about the existing railing. The porch stretches the entire width of the front façade of the house. What is proposed is covering up the two first story windows and demolishing the existing and extending it. The porch does exist. There is something you can stand on each side of the front windows.

**Mr. Edwardson** – It is a pressure treated deck style with wings off it that juts out of it slightly from the line of the existing old porch.

**Mr. Schwarz** – It is very clear and obvious that it is a later addition.

**Ms. Lewis** – We want to give the applicant some guidance. If the majority of the Board is not in favor of extending the porch covering, what are we looking for? What would be acceptable? Do you want the existing railings to stay there?

**Mr. Mohr** – I would rather see that disappear and go back to the porch. That is why I was suggesting something with the south end of the building where there used to be a porch.

**Mr. Schwarz** – You’re creating an L with the addition between the former porch and the addition. Can you fill that in, cover up another parking space with a porch off the side of the addition?

**Mr. Rouzer** – Potentially, certainly with this feedback, we could review with the owners and see if that meets their needs as well.

**Mr. Schwarz** – Some of the stuff that you can bring to us would be an existing elevation and plan of what is being removed or demolished. If you could provide an existing site plan that shows any demo on the site that would be important for us to look at.

**Mr. Rouzer** – This was all constructive and appreciated. Our key takeaway being that differentiation between the existing and the new and coming up with an option that we think is successful for you to take a look at. We will key in on that for our submittal. Our understanding is the massing that is being shown in that layout is successful and differentiating between the historic and the new.

**Mr. Schwarz** – If you have any exterior lighting planned, we definitely want to see that.

**Mr. Gastinger** – Any window replacements or repairs requires quite a bit of documentation.

**Motion to Defer – Mr. Rouzer – Request to Defer – Mr. Schwarz moves to accept request for deferral – Second by Ms. Lewis – Motion passes 8-0.**

## **6. Certificate of Appropriateness**

BAR 21-04-05

485 14<sup>th</sup> Street, NW, TMP 090034000

Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable ADC District

Owner: Hoo House, LLC

Applicant: Greg Winkler, Kurt Wassenaar

Project: Phase 1. Repair/replace windows, misc. exterior repairs and sitework

**Jeff Werner, Staff Report** – Year Built: 1920 District: Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable ADC District Status: Contributing (garage in rear is non-contributing) Submittal: Wassenaar-Winkler Architects/Planners submittal for 485 14th St NW: o BAR Submittal Set, dated April 2, 2021: Narrative (two pages) and sheets G1, EP1 - EP3, C1 - C4, A1 – A11 (19 pages). o Hoo House Renovation - Phase 1, dated March 11, 2021: Sheets G-101, D-101, D-201, E-101 (5 pages). CoA request for repair/replacement of existing windows, the repair/reconstruction of the front porch, the planting of new street trees, and related site work. The existing garage will be razed; it is non-contributing, a CoA is not required for demolition. Also, the scope of work includes elements that are considered routine repair and maintenance, which do not require a CoA; however, in the context of this request, the BAR may ask for clarifications, if necessary. Phase 1, from the applicant’s submittal (numbered here for reference) 1. Repair or rebuilding of the front porch as it now exists and without any architectural changes to the design, size or materials of the porch. Trim in need of repair may be replaced with Azek or other similar materials. 2. Repair of the existing Philadelphia gutter system and downspouts. 3. Repair and/or replacement of the existing windows. (A qualified window restorer will complete an evaluation of the existing windows to determine which can be repaired and which should be replaced. Those findings will be submitted to the BAR.) The proposed replacement windows are, in general, identical to windows approved by the BAR at 513 14th Street. (Applicant will provide it sheets.) 4. Structural repair and cosmetic cleanup of the existing rear stair addition. 5. Landscape cleanup, and replanting including new street trees. 6. Gravel the rear parking area. Discussion and Recommendations Items 2, 4, 5, and 6. Staff finds these consistent with the design guidelines. Anticipating the removal of three trees, staff requested that Phase 1 include the planting of new trees, which are indicated on sheet C4, dated April 2, 2021. Item 1 proposes repair or rebuilding of the front porch as it now exists. Photographs indicate the porch is in disrepair. The railing and lattice are not original. The stairs may not be original; however, they align with the walk, so the original width and location are known. The piers, framing, apron, flooring, columns, entablature, ceiling, trim and roof all appear to be original, with some areas and elements in poor condition. Staff recommends that any new elements match the existing; including, but not limit to: beaded ceiling boards (no faux panels); painted, wood tongue-and-groove flooring (no imitation material); columns (round and engaged); simple cornice at the entablature. Additionally, the porch railing should be replaced in a manner appropriate to the period. Two nearby homes were built at a similar time and might serve as examples for the porch rail--403 14th Street NW (1921) and 1401 Gordon Ave (1925), see images below. Both also have similar columns and entry door designs. Staff recommends that the new railings be similar to these existing examples, and not require custom profiles. The pickets are square stock and the bottom rail is not profiled. The hand rail detail, however, may require some discussion. Item 3 proposes the repair and/or replacement of the existing windows, which are all wood, oneover-one, double-hung. The applicant will rely on the recommendations of an experienced mechanic regarding which windows can be repaired and which should be replaced. That 485 14th Street, NW - CoA Phase 1 (April 15, 2021) 3 information has not yet been provided and, without it, staff cannot offer comment or recommendation. The applicant intends to use windows similar to those approved for 513 14th Street, which were Andersen E-Series, Talon double-hung windows with insulated glass. (The E-Series windows are aluminum clad wood, which the BAR has allowed.) There appears to be an available Andersen trim that is similar to the existing.

**Kurt Wassenaar, Applicant** – This is a repair project. I just want to introduce why we’re doing this project in phases. I didn’t want there to be any hidden agenda pieces of this. We started out with a house. This is the phase I piece that is general repair of a slightly deteriorating house. The back of the house is not in good shape right now. Our intention would be to rebuild right away. Part of this is drive by a desire to have this house repaired and ready for rental in the Fall. We’re concerned about timing relative to getting it ready. The back piece is not in good shape and serviceable. We would propose to

paint it and get it into structurally reasonable shape so that the house can be rented in the Fall. I thought staff's suggestions on the porch were fine. We don't have any problem at all in replicating the railings. We did not proceed to take apart the porch. There's enough loose stuff. I crawled under it. It is in one of those states. If you started to take it apart, you wouldn't know what you have gotten into. We figured we would leave that for later once we got into it. We didn't want to start a demolition on the thing before we talked with the BAR and gotten your 'blessing' with what we were going to do. What we're basically going to do is replace it and restore it as it is right now. Staff had suggested that we use bead board ceiling and that's fine. We will replace the columns. One or two of them are probably serviceable. The other ones may need to be replicated. We would proposed to do that as they are. The porch deck is a tongue in groove wood. We will do our best to replace that. It is probably going to have to come apart completely. It is pretty badly rotted out. You can see that the lattice at the bottom is damaged in a great number of places. A part of that due to a lot of vegetation that has crawled into the edges and pieces. We're going to strip that back and get rid of the pieces of landscaping that are contributing to the deterioration of the porch. We're happy to consider any suggestions the BAR might have on that. Our goal is to put it back as it was according to the Secretary Standards and make that happen. I will apologize to the BAR for not having the window thing resolved. It has been hard to find somebody to come look at the windows, who is qualified to determine if they can be repaired or replaced or restored. My proposal is that we would get that report done and submitted to staff for approval. I know that is a sensitive issue. We don't have any objections restoring the windows as they are. There are a lot of windows. Some in OK shape and some are in really bad shape. A lot of the trees are jaunt and really need to be taken out. We have proposed to replant where needed according to the city standards. We will do that as part of the first phase. The first phase would allow us, with your approval, to get the house put back together again and do the interior work. We have a parallel construction permit in with the city for the interior work. Staff and I talked about the gutters. It has existing Philadelphia gutters. It is my belief that they were probably reworked 5 or ten years ago. They were pretty quality jobs at the time. There were some welded seems that need to be retend and re-glued back together. They're not in bad shape at all. There is fascia rot that would be repaired. We would put the fascia and soffits back as they are now. They're pretty simple profiles.

## **QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC**

No Questions from the Public

## **QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD**

**Mr. Schwarz** – If you were to replace the windows, there was a window picked out that had a jam profile that matched the brick mold on the existing windows. Is the intention to remove the existing brick mold as well as the window?

**Mr. Wassenaar** – Yes. A lot of those are rotted out as well. We had gone through a very extensive exercise on the renovation of the house down the road with the BAR. We finally arrived at a brick mold window assembly virtually identical to what was there earlier that the BAR had approved. We are proposing effectively the same design and window for this, except these windows are one over one and don't have any divided light. Obviously, under the Secretary Standards, if we can restore or save pieces of it that work and are consistent with the replaced windows, we will do that. When we get into them, they might be rotted pieces or other chunks that need to be dealt with. We will include that in our report to you on all of those components of the entire window assembly.

**Mr. Schwarz** – Usually, it is a little easier to approve the replacement of window sash than the brick mold.

**Mr. Wassenaar** – The only reason I am hesitant to that is I don't know what we're going to get into once we start taking these things apart.

**Mr. Mohr** – What is the plan with the metal storms?

**Mr. Wassenaar** – They would go away. They're not an attractive feature of the house. In support of the idea of replacing the windows, we would have the opportunity to put in insulated glass and new systems, which would be a little bit better from the thermal performance standpoint. It is a balance between protecting the Secretary's Standards and doing a good job on the rest of it. That's really the purpose of the report we will get into some detail to try to figure out.

**Mr. Schwarz** – I am looking at your existing and proposed landscape plans. On the new plan, you have on the back corner an 18 inch black locust remain that doesn't show on the existing plan. Was that a mistake?

**Mr. Wassenaar** – That tree is there and it will stay.

**Mr. Schwarz** – There is a tree there and it will remain.

**Mr. Wassenaar** – In the phase III work, it would be demolished. It is a nice tree and one of the few trees that has any redeeming value. Unfortunately, it doesn't fit with the development plan that works in the fully developed phase. We would put in other trees to fill in that part.

**Mr. Schwarz** – We're getting three new poplars along the street. That's great.

**Mr. Edwards** – Why are we only voting on phase I right now? Why are we holding off on voting phases II and III? Is it because you need to see what happens in phase I?

**Mr. Wassenaar** – It is really from a timing standpoint. We have to move on our construction in order to make our deadline. We didn't want to deceive the Board. We also didn't want to delay what we needed to do to meet our deadline for the development side of it. When we talked with staff, we had to debate whether we should disclose the whole thing. Having been the chairman of the Board, we decided it would be better if we just showed you what we're doing completely. We can address that.

**Mr. Werner** – It covers the preliminary discussion as well. If we get it all here, you can see what fits and doesn't fit and get some feeling for it. There is a lot of stuff they can do that is maintenance in phase I that doesn't require the BAR approval. If there are issues with the windows, you may want to pare down so that it is clear what can be done. I would suggest wrapping up where you stand on this phase. We can dive into the next phase.

**Mr. Lahendro** – In the application, it indicates that repairs to the porch will be made to those elements that are severely damaged. They're going to be replaced with synthetic materials. I would certainly like to know more. Does that include Dutchman? Is there a drawing surveying the damage to the front porch that it is going to be repaired? If not, can I have a better description of things like the columns? How much of the columns are damaged? How much is going to be repaired?

**Mr. Wassenaar** – We do not have that information at this time. We went up on a ladder and looked at it and tried to figure out what was what. Until you actually take the thing apart and see what is in it and how it is put together and what the status is, it is very hard to know that.

**Mr. Lahendro** – Your alternative is to tell a carpenter to go at it?

**Mr. Wassenaar** – Not at all.

**Mr. Lahendro** – It would be nice to know what is damaged before you start repairing.

**Mr. Wassenaar** – I will make a suggestion to the Board. What we have done in the past on situations like this where we have difficulty figuring out what is what is to do a little bit of exploratory surgery/repair report for the Board and have it reviewed by staff or a couple members of the Board to make sure we're on track with your standards. From my standpoint as an architect, this is pretty straightforward. The Secretary's Standards are very clear about how we use materials and how they would work. I am open to any suggestions you would like us to follow relative to addressing those concerns.

**Mr. Lahendro** – My memory of the Secretary's Standards is that you don't do Dutchman or replace historic wooden elements with synthetic material.

**Mr. Wassenaar** – I think that is generally the case. We have had a lot of discussions over the years on a number of projects about what point you shift to modern materials that don't require painting and maintenance. If they look identical to what you started out with, are they OK or not? There are a lot of scenarios which develop out of that. I don't know if I have ever gotten complete clarity on what the right direction of that is. We're aware of the standards. We would follow the Secretary's Standards on materials as much as we could.

**Mr. Lahendro** – I don't know what advantage you get if you have a number of ballisters with 20 of them and five need to be replaced. You do those in Azick. You keep the other wood ballisters. I don't know what advantage there is in that. You don't paint those five as often.

**Mr. Wassenaar** – I guess there is a common sense practicality piece of this. My normal suggestion would be if we can replace historic materials with things that look identical to the historic materials in every way, shape, or form, that's a reasonable outcome from an economic and historic preservation standpoint. On the Gordon Avenue building, The Bridges, we had very difficult construction problems relative to face brick application with the setback numbers. We actually used a very thin set brick on a metal backing that was indistinguishable from actual brick. We put up a test panel. The BAR looked at it and approved it. I don't know that anybody had known different about the fact it was fairly sophisticated piece of work to achieve a look and a feel that is indistinguishable from real brick. I am not trying to argue with you. I am just trying to seek clarification. If you can suggest a pathway to resolve these things, I am happy to consider it. We want to be consistent with the city standards and with the Secretary's guidelines. At the same time, I would appeal for any common sense practicality in this particular case. The railing is not consistent with any of the normal typological forms on other railings. I would anticipate we're going to be replacing the entire railing. I don't think we would want any of the existing ballisters or profiles to be part of the final work.

**Mr. Lahendro** – I would like to know what specifically is being requested and for the applicant to do the research and to make the design decisions in consultation with the guidelines and the Secretary's standards and come to us with what they're proposing.

**Mr. Zehmer** – When I look at sheet A-101, which is phase I. It says Phase I work scope. The bullet points specifically say: new replacement windows throughout, removal of front porch and front decking surface, replace with five quarter treated decking, repairs to front floor joice, porch ceiling



joyce, roof rafters to restore pre-damaged state. The letter in front of the application talks about trying to make repairs where possible. The notes in the scope of work say full scale replacement. I think there's a discrepancy between the description and what is in the drawing. That's making it difficult for me to know what we're approving.

**Mr. Wassenaar** – The intent of those indications was that we were going to deal with one way or the other. You're correct in the notations.

**Mr. Zehmer** – For me, it does come back to Jody's recommendation of a more thorough survey to document existing conditions and really understand what can be repaired, which is our preference, versus what is so far gone and may need to be replaced.

**Mr. Wassenaar** – What we didn't want to do was to begin a disassembly exercise in order to determine what was workable and what wasn't workable and get ourselves in trouble with the Board from proceeding with a construction project that wasn't authorized and approved. I am open to whatever process you suggest as the optimum one. We're trying to follow the rules here and do something that makes sense. Guidance would be appreciated.

**Mr. Schwarz** – If they're going to basically replace what is there in kind, that is considered maintenance. That is something that is not under our purview. Is that correct? What we need to do in our motion is to decide how much of this replacement can be done with alternative materials. Is that a fair statement?

**Mr. Werner** – There is a lot of stuff where I would communicate with people. There is a level of trust.

**Mr. Schwarz** – If the applicant was to use all wood to match what is existing to do any patching or repair. If no profiles change, it was all put back the way it was. That is something the applicant could do without an application?

**Mr. Werner** – Yes. Given that the porch railing no longer exists if this was only the porch, I could probably work with the applicant to see this is what needs to happen. You should look at it all together. We say matched in kind. I get a photograph.

**Mr. Schwarz** – You have offered some pictures of neighboring porches that were built at about the same time. We could put in our motion the railing should match the more historic railings. I think we can find a way to craft a motion to make this whole thing work for phase I.

**Mr. Wassenaar** – We are also the contractors for the project. We're licensed A contractors. There's not going to be some third party running around and doing this randomly on the project.

**Mr. Zehmer** – To answer your question about how do you answer some of these questions about going too far, it is common practice to do architectural probes to determine the amount of deterioration.

**Mr. Wassenaar** – If you take a column apart or try to figure out if it is good or not, you don't really know that until you get in there into the inside of it and see how it is put together. Sometimes, I have had the experience of you don't know where to end as you start taking things apart. They're not suitable or structural or reasonable to deal with. There are parts of this porch that have those attributes that worry me about how far we go and where we start to do it. If it was simply drilling a hole into it and saying that it looks fine, that would be one thing. If I am dealing with a whole top of the capital of

a column, I am not going to know that until I take that apart. My plea would be the standard if we discover that, we put it back. We can almost do a halves review where we take a picture of the profile. We document the profile. We agree to put it back together in a way that you can't tell that it was repaired. That would be the reasonable standard. I will defer to your judgement on where that line is. We're trying to do this without spending a million dollars. It is a repair job; not a complete rebuild of the house.

## **COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

No Comments from the Public

## **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

**Mr. Schwarz** – I would like to be able to see if we can craft a motion that says what the line is between when replacements need to be the same material or where a synthetic material can be used. We can just say all must go back as wood. I think the applicant can proceed on the porch almost at will. The main construction on this is the stair piece on the back. We have some site issues and we have the details about the porch.

**Motion – Ms. Lewis - Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed porch repairs and landscaping at 435 14th Street NW satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable ADC District, and that the BAR approves the submitted Phase I application, excluding the window repairs and replacement, with the following conditions:**

- **Any new elements match the existing; including, but not limited to**
  - **Beaded ceiling boards (no faux panels)**
  - **Painted, wood tongue-and-groove flooring (no imitation material)**
  - **Columns (round and engaged)**
  - **Simple cornice at the entablature of the porch**
- **The porch railing should be replaced in a manner appropriate to the period (similar to other properties on 14th Street as specified in the staff report), and the handrail leading down the porch steps should match**

**Carl Schwarz seconds motion. Motion passes (8-0).**

## **E. Preliminary Discussion**

**7. 485 14th Street, NW, TMP 090034000**  
Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable ADC District  
Owner: Hoo House, LLC  
Applicant: Greg Winkler, Kurt Wassenaar

- The BAR and the applicant had a discussion regarding phases II and III of 485 14<sup>th</sup> Street Northwest.
- The applicant provided information on the renovation of the existing house.
- The building will meet code requirements in the Fall for occupancy according to the applicant.
- There is a high probability of doing the whole project according to the applicant. It will be dependent on the timing.
- The little additions in the back were done later. The applicant wants to differentiate from the existing part of the house with the new part of the house that is being added.
- The applicant is trying to keep the rooflines together.

- The project is very similar to a project down the street from this project.
- No landscaping has been included to show the different architectural aspects of the project.
- The BAR asked questions and provided feedback to the applicant regarding phases II and III of this project.
- The applicant indicated that he would return to the BAR with both phases II and III at the same time.

The meeting was recessed for ten minutes.

**8.** 120 Oakhurst Circle, TMP 110025000

Oakhurst-Gildersleeve ADC District

Owner: Tenth and Main, LLC

Applicant: Bill Chapman

Project: Rear addition on residence

- This project has been previously reviewed by the BAR.
- The applicant would like for the BAR to determine whether they would entertain this project proposal.
- The applicant presented what he envisions with this project to the BAR.
- Members of the BAR asked questions of the applicant during the preliminary discussion. Members of the BAR also provided feedback about this proposed project.
- Mr. Lahendro did bring up that the structure is contributing in the state and national historic districts. Mr. Lahendro also brought up the scale and the massing relationship between the addition and the existing house and the context of the district.
- The biggest issue that members of the BAR had with this proposed project was the massing and the height of the structure.

**F. Other Business**

Staff Questions/Discussion

Valentine Horse door window

PLACE Update

**G. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 PM.